

REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed on December 4, 2006, in which claims 1-14 were rejected, claim 15 was objected to, and claims 16-19 were allowed.

I. Response to Double Patenting Rejection

In the Office Action, claims 1-14 were rejected on the ground of non-statutory, obviousness-type, double patenting over claims 30 and 35-44 of Crump et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,125,512 (“the Crump patent”) in view of Jamalabad et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,823,230 (“the Jamalabad patent”). With this Amendment, Applicant is filing a timely terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR § 1.321(c). Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

II. Response to Claim 15 Objection

In the Office Action, claim 15 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but is otherwise allowable if rewritten in independent form. As discussed above, Applicant is filing a timely terminal disclaimer to obviate the rejection of claim 14, from which claim 15 depends. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

III. Response to the Request for Clarification of the term “Additional”

In the Office Action, claims 16-19 were determined to be allowable upon clarification of the term “additional”. Applicant notes that claim 1 also includes the term “additional”. With this amendment, claims 1 and 16 are amended to replace the term “additional” with “addition”, such that claims 1 and 16 require “using the mold tool in an injection molding machine, without the addition of any reinforcement fill material or layers, to create the prototype part by injection molding of plastic.” This corresponds to the terminology used in the Brief Summary of the Invention section (PCT/US03/10219, page 4, lines 5-7). Applicant believes this amendment adequately clarifies the terminology of claims 1 and 16.

First Named Inventor: William J. Priedeman, Jr.

Application No.: 10/511,783

6

CONCLUSION

The prior art of record does not show, suggest, or teach all the limitations in claims 1-19. Additionally, Applicant believes that the prior art cited in the accompanying Information Disclosure Statement also does not show, suggest, or teach all the limitations in claims 1-19. Accordingly, pending claims 1-19 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.

Date: 2/28/07

By: Brian R. Morrison
Brian R. Morrison, Reg. No. 58,455
THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING
312 South Third Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1002
Telephone: (612) 339-1863
Fax: (612) 339-6580